

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated June 6, 2005, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 30 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 34 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,076,083 (Baker) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,647,383 (August et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,434,796 (Weininger) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,493,729 (Nigawara et al.). Claims 12, 13 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Baker. Claims 1, 8-11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of August et al. Claims 15, 19 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of August et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,103 (King). Claims 2-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of August et al. in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,668,633 (Cheetam et al.). Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of August et al. and further in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,560,005 (Hoover et al.). Claims 17, 21, 25 and 30-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of August et al. and in further view of King in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,431 (Salvati et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,161,110 (Curtis et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,290,774 (Solomon et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,340,563 (Finkelstein et al.). Claim 27 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of King. Claim

29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of King in view of Salvati et al in view of Curtis et al. in view of Solomon et al. in further view of Finkelstein et al.

By the present response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 11, 12 and 30-34 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-34 remain pending in the present application.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

Claims 1, 30 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicants have amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully submit that these claims clearly contain statutory subject matter. These claims relate to a process for generating information based on input data received where the input data is processed and output data generated and displayed at a display on an apparatus. This is clearly statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

The Examiner indicates that the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 are further rejected here, but the Examiner provides no substantive details regarding rejection of these claims under §103. Therefore, the Examiner has not issued a proper rejection of claims 1, 30 and 34 under §103 and, therefore, these comments will be ignored. The same applies in response to other portions of the Office Action where this statement is asserted but no substantive rejections of the claims have been made.

Claim 34 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of August et al., Weininger and Nigawara et al. Applicants have discussed the deficiencies of Baker and August et al. in Applicants' previously-filed response and reassert all arguments submitted in that response. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and provide the following additional remarks.

Weininger discloses evolving successive populations of molecular structure and evaluating each evolved structure of each population with desired physical and/or theoretical properties. An initial population of molecules is provided in terms of representations of a number of member molecules. Evaluation is performed by a fitness function, which compares the initial population and evolved generations of member representations with the set of desired properties to provide a numerical measure or value of fitness for each structure. That numerical value indicates how closely the compared member representation corresponds with the set of desired properties. Another population is generated by changing the structure of selected molecules and the process is repeated until an acceptable molecule evolves.

Nigawara et al. discloses a processing system for knowledge database in which indices representing the degrees of certainty of causal relations between an event and plural events relevant to the first-mentioned event are stored. The system has an input unit for inputting information on those actually experienced among events inferred based on the knowledge database, an updating unit for updating the indices so that, among the plural causal relations, the certainty of the causal relation corresponding to the actually experienced event inputted by the input means is made

higher relative to the certainties of the other causal relations, and a storing unit for storing back the thus-updated indices again in the knowledge database. This allows an expert system with the processing system to perform inference with higher certainty.

Regarding claim 34, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of this claims of, inter alia, searching a meta database for a rule for solving a problem, the database containing a physical or chemical rule or solution having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in advance, which has been stored in a content offer server in advance, in response to an instruction and improving physical or chemical parameter and deteriorating parameter, or actual example or a case database regarding a new solution to the problem in response to the problem from a user, or displaying data on a display at the site, regarding the examples of new solutions to solve the problem with corresponding rules. The Examiner asserts that Baker discloses displaying data regarding examples of new solutions to solve the problem with corresponding rules at col. 8, lines 9-31 and col. 1, lines 46-49. However, these portions of Baker merely disclose that a trouble ticket is used to record a problem and that once the problem is resolved, the trouble ticket is closed and a permanent record of the problem and its development is recorded in database, and that in a rule-based system the knowledge base is made up of a set of conditions/action rules in the form of

“if . . . then” and a problem is presented to the system in the form of a set of propositions stated to be known to be true. These portions of Baker do not disclose or suggest anything related to displaying data regarding examples of new solutions to solve a problem, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, these portions of Baker do not disclose or suggest displaying data with corresponding rules.

The Examiner admits that Baker does not disclose or suggest a meta database which contains physical or chemical rule or solution but asserts that August et al. discloses these limitations in Figs. 1, 10, 15 and col. 7, lines 60-66. However, these portions of August et al. merely disclose a network configuration incorporating an embodiment of August et al.'s invention as it relates to the worldwide web, a flowchart showing profile provisioning for search function, a flowchart showing a process that determines what to put into a profile database if the source is a company database, and that after the creation of the database has been completed, the database may be used in a meta search engine, which allows users to specify which search engines to use and also request any available data from the popular picks database, and that the database may also be used to create a new type of search engine combining the popular pick database and a conventional search engine. These portions of August et al. do not disclose or suggest a meta database that contains physical or chemical rule or solution having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and deteriorating physical or chemical parameter, as recited in the claims of the present application. These

portions of August et al. do not disclose or suggest anything related to physical or chemical rule or physical or chemical parameter or deteriorating physical or chemical parameter. Further, August et al. does not disclose or suggest anything related to searching a meta database for a rule for solving a problem, as recited in the claims of the present application.

The Examiner further asserts that Weininger teaches a database containing physical or chemical rules or solution indexed by improving physical or chemical parameter at col. 2, lines 15-47 and col. 1, lines 52-68. However, these portions of Weininger merely disclose successful approaches for computer assisted methods of designing molecules, and frameworks for rational design based on the ability to rationalize the activity of various chemicals in terms of their molecular structure. Applicants submit that the disclosure of Weininger has absolutely nothing to do with the technology as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions of Weininger do not disclose or suggest anything related to searching a meta database for a rule for solving a problem where the database contains a physical or chemical rule or solution having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter. Weininger relates to designing molecules, which has absolutely nothing to do with the limitations in the claims of the present application. This also applies to the Nigawara et al. disclosure that relates to indices representing the degrees of certainty of causal relations between an event and plural events.

Moreover, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine Baker (that relates to a diagnostic system utilizing a Bayesian network model having link weight updated experimentally), with August et al. (that relates to providing interactive dialog and iterative search functions to find information) and Weininger (that relates to designing molecules with desired properties by evolving successive populations) and Nigawara et al. (that relates to a knowledge database in which indices representing the degrees of certainty of casual relations between an event and plural events relevant to the first mentioned event are stored). The technology in these various references are unrelated and relate to entirely different problems and solutions, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine these references in an attempt to achieve the limitations in the claims of the present application. Further, as noted previously, the combination fails to achieve the limitations in the combination of the claims of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 34 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 12, 13 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Baker. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claim 12, Applicants submit that Baker does not disclose the limitations in the combination of this claim of, inter alia, accepting data regarding an instruction of a problem by a user including an information on a database to be searched, searching either a meta database or a case database for a rule for solving the problem, which had been stored in a separate apparatus including a content offer server in advance, having solution rules stored in association with the data regarding a solution to solve the problem and having examples of new solutions in association with the problem, each of the examples including an instrument having a predetermined function according to the rules, each of the rules being physical or chemical rules having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in advance or extracting and displaying at a display at the first apparatus, a new solution corresponding to a result of having searched for the solution rules. The Examiner asserts that Baker discloses accepting data regarding instruction by a user of a problem at Fig. 3, items 212, 202, col. 1, lines 24-26, and col. 8, lines 9-31. However, as noted previously, these portions of Baker merely disclose information regarding the trouble ticket and how a problem is recorded on a trouble ticket, that computer based diagnostic/expert systems are common and applied to diagnosing problems in many different areas, and that as noted previously, a problem is recorded on a trouble ticket and history associated with development of the problem recorded as well as the cause, and once the problem is repaired, the ticket is closed and recorded in a database. This is not accepting data regarding an instruction of a

problem by a user including an information on a database to be searched, as recited in the claims of the present application. The trouble ticket disclosed in Baker has nothing to do with an instruction of a problem including an information on a database to be searched, as recited in the claims of the present application. The trouble ticket in Baker is not an instruction of a problem.

The Examiner further asserts that Baker discloses searching either a meta database or a case database at col. 1, lines 45-67. However, as noted previously, these portions of Baker merely disclose details regarding the operation of a "rule-based" system where the knowledge base is made up of a set of conditions/action rules in the form of "if . . . then", and that in this type system, rule-based reasoning proceeds in two modes, forward chaining or backward chaining. However, this is not searching, in accordance with information, either a meta database or a case database for a rule for solving a problem, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, these portions of Baker do not disclose or suggest anything related to solution rules regarding a solution to solve a problem having examples of new solutions in association with the problem. Further, these portions of Baker do not disclose or suggest anything related to each of the rules being physical or chemical rules having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in advance. Baker merely discloses details regarding a "rule-based" system.

The Examiner further asserts that Baker discloses extracting and displaying a new solution at Fig. 3, items 202, 203, 208, 210 and 214. However, these portions

of Baker merely disclose a TCP/IP network data collector, team results, Bayesian network model, graphical user interface control and display, and a model update component all being part of a block diagram illustrating a trouble ticket fault management system according to Baker. These portions of Baker do not disclose or suggest extracting and displaying a new solution, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, these portions of Baker do not disclose or suggest a new solution corresponding to a result having searched for the solution rules.

Regarding claims 13 and 26, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 12 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. For example, Applicants submit that Baker does not disclose or suggest where the function to extract the solution corresponding to the solution rules has a function to search a content database having information of solutions associated with the solution rules, or where the predetermined function of the instrument includes an analyzing function.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Baker does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 12, 13 and 26 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1, 8-11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of August et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 11, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, receiving an instruction or data including an information on a database to be searched related to a problem input by a user, searching a meta database or a case database for a rule for solving the problem in response to the instruction input, the meta database including a plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding new solutions for any of the problems, each of the rules being a physical or chemical rule having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in advance, the case database containing the new solutions to solve the problems, each example including an instrument having a predetermined function according to the plurality of rules to determine information on a relationship to between one of the solutions and one of the problems to be solved thereby to generate data regarding the examples of new solutions, or displaying on a display at the site server, the data regarding the examples of new solutions to solve the problem related to the instruction input with corresponding instruments and with corresponding rules.

The Examiner asserts that Baker discloses receiving an instruction input by a user at Fig. 3, items 210 and 211. However, these portions of Baker merely disclose a graphical user interface, a keyboard and mouse. This is not receiving an instruction including an information on a database to be searched related to a problem input by a user, as recited in the claims of the present application. The Examiner parses the limitations in the claims of the present invention into different discrete pieces (non-associated) in an attempt to find portions of the cited references that disclose these limitations. For example, the Examiner asserts that Baker teaches "searching a case database" at col. 2, lines 1-23. However, this is not searching a case database for a rule for solving the problem in response to the instruction input, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions merely disclose details regarding a rule-based system being a case-based system.

The Examiner further asserts that Baker discloses a case database containing a solution to solve a problem, each example including an instrument at col. 1, lines 24-26. However, as noted previously, these portions of Baker merely disclose that diagnostic/expert systems are common and are applied to diagnosing the problems in many different areas. This has nothing to do with searching a database in response to an instruction input, the database including a plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding new solutions for any of the problems, as recited in the claims of the present application.

The Examiner further asserts that Baker discloses displaying data regarding the examples of solutions to solve a problem related to the instruction input at col. 8,

lines 9-31. However, as noted previously, these portions of Baker merely disclose details regarding the trouble ticket, and the information included on the trouble ticket. These portions of Baker do not disclose or suggest anything related to displaying data regarding examples of new solutions to solve a problem.

Moreover, the Examiner admits that Baker does not disclose or suggest a meta database but asserts that August et al. teaches these limitations in Figs. 1, 10, 15 and col. 7, lines 60-66. However, as noted previously regarding claim 34, these portions of August et al. do not disclose or suggest anything related to a meta database being searched for a rule for solving a problem, or a meta database including a plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding new solutions for any of the problems. Here again, the Examiner appears to slice this limitation in the present claims into smaller pieces and assert various portions in August et al. in various locations as disclosing these individual pieces of the limitation. However, none of the cited portions disclose the limitations in the claims of the present application. Moreover, the Examiner is reminded that the limitations in the claims of the present application should be taken in combination and it is an improper rejection to simply slice off words and phrases and identify these words and phrases in one or more references in an attempt to reject the claims. In another example, the Examiner asserts that August et al. discloses "a meta database including a rule" at col. 2, lines 47-50 and discloses "extracted" at col. 2, lines 18-32, and "from a plurality of actual examples" at col. 15, lines 33-39. However, these portions of August et al. do not disclose or suggest a meta database including a

plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding new solutions for any of the problems, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claims 9, 10, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24 and 28, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 8 and 11 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where the predetermined function of the instrument comprises an analyzing function, or displaying a history of the instructions input by the user.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 8-11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24 and 28 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 15, 19 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of August et al. and King. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 8 and 11 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicants submit that King does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Baker and August et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where the instruction inputted by the user relates to a

combination of a state selection, a part selection and an analysis condition of selection, and a corresponding solution includes a combination of an analytical technique and an analytical instrument.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 15, 18 and 23 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 2-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of August et al. and Cheetam et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Cheetam et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Baker and August et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest displaying a plurality of solution rules based on the meta rules searched out from the meta database in order to urge the user to think up an idea for a new solution, or displaying a plurality of examples of solutions searched out from the case database in order to urge the user to think up an idea for a new solution.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in

the combination of each of claims 2-5 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of August et al. and further in view of Hoover et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Hoover et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Baker and August et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where in order that each of customers can be offered customized solutions and contents, a company database is provided that is concerned with companies which the customer belonged to, and searched for customer's information, and problems and solutions supposed for each customer are enumerated by use of the search result.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 6 and 7 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 17, 21, 25 and 30-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of August et al. and further in view of King,

Salvati et al., Curtis et al., Solomon et al. and Finkelstein et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claims 30-33, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, searching either one of a meta database or a case database for a rule for solving the problem, in response to an instruction including an information on a database to be searched related to the problem input by a user, the meta database including a plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding new solutions to solve problems, each of the rules being a physical or chemical rule having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in advance, each of the examples including an analytical instrument to generate a relationship between each solution and each problem to be solved thereby, the instruction being related to a combination of a state selection, a part selection and an analysis condition of selection and a corresponding solution comprising a combination of an analytical technique and the analytical instrument, or displaying data regarding the examples of new solutions to solve the problem input by the user along with corresponding instrument based on a search result and with corresponding rules in the plurality of rules in the meta database, history of input instructions, and a plurality of instruments in the solutions with their priority levels in an order of degree of difficulty in destroying a sample to be analyzed when a morphologic observation is selected as the analysis selection. The Examiner asserts

that Baker teaches searching a case database, and displaying data regarding the examples of solutions to solve the problems and asserts the same portions of Baker asserted previously regarding these limitations. However, as noted previously, Baker does not disclose or suggest searching a meta database or a case database for a rule for solving a problem in response to an instruction including an information on a database to be searched related to the problem, as recited in the claims of the present invention. Further, Baker does not disclose or suggest displaying data regarding examples of new solutions to solve the problem along with corresponding instrument based on a search result and with corresponding rules in the plurality of rules in the database, as recited in the claims of the present application.

The Examiner again parses the limitations into different words and phrases in an unrelated matter, for example, asserting that “the instruction being related to state selection” is disclosed in Baker at col. 5, lines 43-46. However, this portion of Baker merely discloses the HUGIN software including an editor which is used to specify nodes and possible states of nodes in a Bayesian network as well as the links between nodes and the conditional probability matrices at each node. This is not an instruction including an information on a database to be searched related to a problem input by a user, the instruction being related to a combination of a state selection, a part selection and an analysis condition of selection, as recited in the claims of the present application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to identify “the entire limitation in the claim” in a particular reference to properly reject the claims.

The Examiner further asserts that Baker discloses an analysis condition of selection and a combination of an analytical technique and the analytical instrument at col. 8, lines 59-63. However, these portions of Baker merely disclose that an interface allows a network operator to display raw data collected from the network test organized according to its use in the probabilistic analysis supporting a suggested solution to the fault. The Examiner also cites col. 12, lines 66-67 which merely discloses a TCP/IP data collector that iteratively executes diagnostic utilities to retrieve status data from network devices. However, none of these portions of Baker disclose or suggest the limitations taken in combination in the claims of the present application of an instruction from a user being related to a combination of a state selection, a part selection and an analysis condition of selection, and a corresponding solution comprising a combination of an analytical technique and the analytical instrument, as recited in the claims of the present application.

The Examiner admits that Baker does not disclose or suggest searching a meta database but asserts again that August et al. discloses these limitations at Figs. 1, 10, 15, and col. 7, lines 60-66. However, as noted previously, these portions of August et al. do not disclose or suggest these limitations. The Examiner then again proceeds to cut and slice the limitations in the claims of the present application into specific words and phrases and then find portions of the various cited references that the Examiner asserts discloses these bits and pieces. However, none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, disclose the limitations in the claims of the present application, as has been previously pointed out.

Moreover, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine the various seven references asserted by the Examiner in an attempt to achieve the limitations in the claims of the present application. One of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine these references from various technologies, for example Baker related to utilizing a Bayesian network model having link weights updated experimentally, August et al. related to providing interactive dialog and iterative search functions to find information, King related to selecting a parts kit detail for the installation of a pressure transducer, Salvati et al. related to a compact imaging instrument system, Curtis et al. related to interactively presenting event data, Solomon et al. related to sequential hydride vapor phase epitaxy, and Finkelstein et al. related to typographic genotyping. The present invention is related to providing solutions for solving problems on a display. These various references are not related at all to this technology and further are not even related to each other, and therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine these references in an attempt to achieve the limitations in the claims of the present application. Moreover, this combination fails to achieve the limitations in the claims of the present application as has been already noted.

Regarding claims 17, 21 and 25, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 8 and 11 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest displaying a plurality of instruments in the solution with their priority levels in an order

of degree of difficult in destroying a sample to be analyzed when a morphologic observation is selected as the analysis selection.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 17, 21, 25 and 30-33 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 27 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of King. Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 12 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where the instruction inputted by the user relates to a combination of a state selection, a part selection and an analysis condition of selection and a corresponding solution includes a combination of analytical technique and an analytical instrument.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 27 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker, in view of Salvati et al., Curtis et al., Solomon et al. and Finkelstein et al. Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 12 and,

therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that neither Salvati et al., Curtis et al., Solomon et al., nor Finkelstein et al. overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Baker. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest displaying a plurality of information in the solution with their priority levels in an order of degree of difficulty in destroying a sample to be analyzed when a morphologic observation is selected as the analysis selection.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 29 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-34 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

U.S. Application No. 09/923,427

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. 500.40449X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb
(703) 684-1120